

Application No. 10/037,940
Amendment dated January 3, 2007
After Final Office Action of October 2, 2006

2

Docket No.: 56872(70904)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 03 2007**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a personal interview on December 7, 2007. This response follows up on that interview.

First, Applicants note that as of the close of business on January 3, 2007, the undersigned attorney has not received an Interview Summary form, although the Examiner did leave the message today that at least the Interview Summary would be faxed today. One is requested. (Applicant thanks the Examiner for her telephone call today and the information regarding the case status.)

Applicants summarize the interview as follows:

1. The finality of the pending Action will be withdrawn;
2. Claim 5 and the Venable et al. and Oashi et al. references were discussed; and
3. The Examiner wished to consider the arguments, but agreed that the claims were probably allowable over the art of record.

A more specific recording of Applicants' arguments at the interview is detailed below.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants formally request a withdrawal of the finality of the pending Action under MPEP §706.07(e).

Applicants again gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner has found patentable subject matter in claims 16, 22, and 23.

As discussed at the interview, the pending claims define features that are not found in the prior art, or suggested by the prior art.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of claims 5-11, 15, 19-21, 25/21, 25/24, and 26-27 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,154 to

Application No. 10/037,940
Amendment dated January 3, 2007
After Final Office Action of October 2, 2006

3

Docket No.: 56872(70904)

Venable in view of Oashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,767,845. Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) of claims 13, 14, and 17-18 as obvious over Venable and Oashi et al. when further combined with Wood, U.S. Patent No. 6,453,127.

As discussed at the interview, Venable and Oashi et al. teach systems that have one display screen. In Venable, it is the monitor of the p.c. 22. Screen 400 (Fig. 10) is an example of the display on the p.c. 22. In Oashi et al. it is unit 212 in Fig. 2, CRT 317 in Figs. 3, 17 and 19, or CRT 1317 in Fig. 13. Fig. 8 of Oashi et al. illustrates the data of a page stream.

Every claim now pending specifies at least two displays, not one, and that each of these displays is associated with one of a scanner or a printer. There is no teaching or suggestion of this construction in the prior art. Indeed, display on one screen of information relating to multiple pieces of equipment is a confusing arrangement that the present invention overcomes. (See specification, p. 4)

Moreover, the present claims require that these two displays are operatively interconnected user interfaces. As stated in claim 5, "in response to a command entered by one of these user interface sections, the other user interface section changes its display state."

The prior art have no teaching or suggestion of two graphical user interfaces, on two separate pieces of equipment, that are so connected operatively.

Further, the Venable display 400 (Fig. 10) relates to the scanner and the scanned images. It does not control a printer. Still further, there is no motivation, teaching, or suggestion that a technique for storing data on a CD-ROM (Oashi) can or should be combined with the image control of a scanner of a copier (Venable).

The Wood reference discloses a way to correct multiple remote users (p.c.'s 11 and scanners 14) with one or more copiers/printers 15. As in Venable and Oashi et al., a user has only one screen, that of the p.c. There is no disclosure of a separate

Application No. 10/037,940
Amendment dated January 3, 2007
After Final Office Action of October 2, 2006

4

Docket No.: 56872(70904)

graphical user interface at any copier/printer, or any interconnected operability between plural separate graphical user interfaces associated with a scanner and a printer.

In view of the above Remarks and the discussion at the December 7, 2006 interview, Applicants believe that the pending application is clearly in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 439-4444

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant